## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VASEGA F. TILI,	) No. C 11-1911 JSW (PR)
Petitioner, vs.	ORDER OF DISMISSAL; GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS; DENYING MOTION TO
LELAND MCEWEN, Warden,	) HOLD IN ABEYANCE
Respondent.	) (Docket Nos. 2 & 3)

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner concedes that he presently has a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pending before the California Supreme Court. The Ninth Circuit has held unequivocally that the habeas exhaustion requirement is not satisfied if there is a pending proceeding in state court, even if the issue the petitioner seeks to raise in federal court has been finally determined by the highest available state court. Sherwood v. Tomkins, 716 F.2d 632, 634 (9th Cir. 1983). This is because the pending state action might result in reversal of the conviction on some other ground, mooting the federal case. Id.

The petition is DISMISSED without prejudice to refiling it when no further proceedings are pending in the California state courts. See id. (if state court action is pending, claims are not exhausted). In light of this dismissal, Petitioner's motion to hold 

the petition in abeyance is DENIED.	Petitioner's motion for leave to proceed in forma
pauperis is GRANTED.	

Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases now requires a district court to rule on whether a Petitioner is entitled to a certificate of appealability in the same order in which the petition is decided. Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that a reasonable jurist would find this Court's denial of his claim on procedural grounds debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Consequently, no certificate of appealability is warranted in this case.

This order terminates docket numbers 2 and 3. The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 13, 2011